

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,990		07/02/2001	Michael John Bader	2001B053	1190
23455	7590	08/19/2004	EXAMINER		
EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY P O BOX 2149				JACKSON, MONIQUE R	
BAYTOW	BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1773	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/896,990	BADER ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Monique R Jackson	1773
Paried 6	The MAILING DATE of this communication a for Reply		vith the correspondence address
A SH THE - Ext afte - If th - Fail Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF. MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR er SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. he period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a roop period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stay reply received by the Office later than three months after the manned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thir id will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute. Cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. RANDONED (35.U.S.C. 8.133)
Status			
1)⊠ 2a)⊠ 3)⊟		his action is non-final. wance except for formal matt	
Disposi	tion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 15-27 and 29-35 is/are pending in the day of the above claim(s) is/are with definition [15]. Is/are allowed. Claim(s) 15-27 and 29-35 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and the claim [15].	rawn from consideration.	
	•		
	The specification is objected to by the Exami The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) are		by the Everines
. •)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ents have been received. Ints have been received in A Iority documents have been Iority (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachmen			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview S Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date
i) 🔲 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06 or No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of In 6) Other:	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 8/1/04 has been entered. Claim 28 has been canceled. New claims 34-35 have been added. Claims 15-27 and 29-35 are pending in the application.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Objections/Rejections

3. Applicant's arguments, filed 8/1/04, with respect to the previously recited claim objections and claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections and rejections as recited in paragraphs 3-6 of the prior office action have been withdrawn. The Examiner further notes that paragraph 7 of the prior office action contained a typographical error and should have recited Claims 15-33 not 15-31 as is evident from the content of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 15-27 and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bader et al (USN 5,753,363) in view of Nagai et al for the reasons generally recited in the prior office action and restated below.

Bader et al teach a biaxially oriented, heat sealable metallizable multilayer film comprising an isotactic polypropylene core (b); an olefin external surface layer (a) comprising EPB; a metallizable skin layer (c) preferably comprising HDPE; a metal layer preferably aluminum deposited on the metallizable skin layer (c); wherein the core layer comprises 70-95% of the thickness of the film and each skin layer, for example, comprises 6% of the thickness; and wherein skin layer (a) and/or (c) can comprise additional antiblock particles other than the crosslinked polysiloxane particles wherein a

Application/Control Number: 09/896,990

Art Unit: 1773

major proportion of these particles will be of such a size that a significant portion of their surface area will extend beyond the exposed surface of such skin layer (Abstract; Col. 2, lines 31-62; Col. 3, lines 20-22 and lines 38-60; Col. 4, lines 43-67; Col. 5, lines 1-12 and lines 16-28; Col. 6, lines 14-26; Examples.)

Bader et al do not specifically teach the size of the antiblock or PMMA particles or the thickness of the layers as instantly claimed, however, it is well known in the art that layer thickness is a result-effective variable affecting the mechanical and sealing properties of the resulting multilayer film and hence one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to utilize routine experimentation to determine the optimum layer thickness for a particular end use. Further, with regards to the PMMA antiblocking particles, Nagai et al teach that crosslinked PMMA particles in an amount of 0.05 to 0.5 wt% and having a particle size of 0.5 to 4µm being selected in a range of 0.7 to 2 times the thickness of a polyolefin surface layer of a biaxially oriented polypropylene film provides anti-scratching properties, lubrication and anti-blocking properties to the film. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to utilize PMMA particles having a particle size up to 2 times the thickness of the surface layer as taught by Nagai et al in the invention taught by Bader et al, utilizing routine experimentation to determine the optimum particle size and amount to provide the desired antiblocking properties for a particular end use.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/1/04 with respect to the rejection over Bader et al have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the Bader et al reference is disqualified under 103(c) as a section 102(e) prior art reference in

Application/Control Number: 09/896,990

Art Unit: 1773

the 103(a) rejection considering the reference and the instant invention were commonly owned and assigned at the time of the instant invention. However, the Examiner notes that the Bader et al patent, with an issue date of 5/19/98, which is more than one year prior to the filing date of the instant application, has been utilized in the 103(a) rejection as a 102(b) prior art reference and hence Applicant's statement of common ownership does not overcome the rejection.

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monique R Jackson whose telephone number is 571-272-1508. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays, 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul J Thibodeau can be reached on 571-272-1516. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Monique R. Jackson Primary Examiner

Technology Center 1700

August 11, 2004